



RECEIVED

MAY 15 2002

TC 1700

COPY OF PAPERS  
ORIGINALLY FILED

1772  
#9  
Gues  
5/29/02

HUBR 1165 (10023593)

**Certificate of Mailing**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 on May 2, 2002.  
Date: May 2, 2002 Signature: Fani Malikouzakis  
Fani Malikouzakis

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s) : Stuke et al. ✓  
Serial No. : 09/647,207 ✓  
Filed : January 8, 2001 ✓  
For : ADHESIVE-FREE POLYMER COMPONENT JOINTS FOR  
PRODUCING CLOSED MICRO- AND NANO-CHANNEL  
STRUCTURES  
Art Unit : 1772 ✓  
Examiner : C. A. Simone ✓  
Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
May 2, 2002

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

SIR:

Responsive to the requirement for restriction dated April 3, 2002, applicants wish to elect Group 1, claims 23-40, drawn to a process for the adhesive-free production of polymeric components, with traverse.

The restriction requirement is traversed for the following reasons: The Examiner contends that claims 23-40; drawn to a "process for the adhesive-face production of

polymeric components", and claims 41-44, drawn to "polymeric constituents" are separate inventions. Applicants disagree. Claim 23 (from which claims 24-40 depend) describes a detailed, multi-step process for preparing polymeric components without the use of adhesive. Claim 41 (from which claims 42-44 depend) describes the polymeric components made from this very process. The components of claims 41-44 are made using the process of claims 24-40. Conversely, practicing the process of claims 24-40 will result in products such as those of claims 41-44. Given the high degree of inter-relation between these two claim groups, it cannot be said that those groups represent separate inventions. Also, given this inter-relation of the process and component claims, examination of both claim sets would place little if any additional burden on the Examiner.

Finally, the Examiner's comment that "the special technical features of the claimed invention are not found to define a contribution over the prior art" is believed to be irrelevant to the issue of unity of invention. Moreover, the Examiner has not explained the relevance of the disclosure of WO 90 14940 to the issue of unity of invention.

For the reasons outlined above, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirement. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any fees are due to enter this paper, authorization is given to charge Deposit Account no. 50-0624.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

By David Rubin  
David Rubin  
Reg. No. 40,314

666 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10103  
(212) 318-3148